UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

CHASSIDY F. LUCAS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

CASE NO. C11-5350BHS

v.

JOE CAMACHO, et al.,

ORDER

Defendants.

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants Joe Camacho, Deborah Camacho, and Angela Stephenson's ("Camacho Defendants") request for fees (Dkt. 63), Defendants George and Lori Parker's ("Parkers") request for fees (Dkt. 65), and Plaintiffs Chassidy Lucas, Bianca Lucas, and CB Stormwater's ("Plaintiffs") motion for trial (Dkt. 68). The Court has reviewed the briefs filed in support of the requests and motion and the remainder of the file.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On May 5, 2011, Plaintiffs filed a complaint alleging patent infringement by both the Camacho Defendants and the Parkers. Dkt. 1.

On July 25, 2011, Plaintiffs filed a motion to compel. Dkt. 34. On August 1, 2011, the Camacho Defendants responded. Dkt. 40. On August 2, 2011, the Parkers responded. Dkt. 42. On September 8, 2011, the Court denied Plaintiffs' motion, awarded Defendants reasonable fees in responding to the motion, and requested briefing on the amount of such fees. Dkt. 60.

On September 13, 2011, the Camacho Defendants filed a brief in support of their fees. Dkt. 62. On September 19, 2011, the Parkers filed a brief in support of their fees. Dkt. 65.

On September 21, 2011, Plaintiffs filed a motion for trial. Dkt. 68. On September 28, 2011, the Camacho Defendants responded. Dkt. 70. On September 29, 2011, the Parkers responded. Dkt. 73.

II. DISCUSSION

A. Fees

In this case, the Court awarded Defendants reasonable fees in responding to Plaintiffs' premature motion to compel. The Camacho Defendants have requested \$300 in fees. The Court finds that this amount is reasonable. Therefore, Plaintiffs are ordered to pay the Camacho Defendants \$300 within a reasonable time.

The Parkers also request fees for the time expended representing themselves pro se. The Parkers assert that they expended valuable time and resources in responding to Plaintiffs' motion and request to be reimbursed at a rate that the Court deems reasonable. First, the Parkers' response was very similar to the Camacho Defendants' response, which was prepared by an attorney and submitted one day prior to the Parkers' response. The Court is not persuaded that the Parkers expended valuable time or resources drafting their response. Second, the Parkers have failed to document their time or submit such documentation for the Court's consideration. Therefore, the Court denies the Parkers' request for fees because they have failed to provide evidence of an appropriate reimbursement amount.

B. Motion for Trial

Although Plaintiffs' motion is somewhat confusing, it appears that Plaintiffs have submitted a motion to set a trial date instead of participating in the initial conference and submitting a Joint Status Report. *See* Dkt. 68. Plaintiffs are informed that it is their

responsibility to schedule an initial conference and submit a Joint Status Report. See Dkt.

3. Failure to do either of these tasks may result in dismissal of the action for failure to comply with the Court's explicit order. In any event, the Court denies Plaintiffs' motion to set a trial date and orders Plaintiffs to submit a Joint Status Report that is signed by all parties no later than October 28, 2011. Failure to submit such a report may result in dismissal unless good cause is shown for such failure.

III. ORDER

Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Camacho Defendants' request for fees (Dkt. 63) is **GRANTED**, the Parkers' request for fees (Dkt. 65) is **DENIED**, and Plaintiffs' motion for trial request (Dkt. 68) is **DENIED**. Plaintiffs shall file a Joint Status Report signed by all parties no later than October 28, 2011.

DATED this 17th day of October, 2011.

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge